

REMARKS

1. With respect to paragraph 1 of the 4/28/05 Office Action, the following species are not shown in the Applicant's drawings: a, c, f, h and j. Applicant had selected species b, c, e, g and i. The claims have been amended to more clearly define the present invention. Applicant believes that the claims as presently presented are allowable and are directed to a single species as clearly disclosed in the drawings.

16. With respect to paragraph 16 of the 4/28/05 Action, Claims 2-23 have been cancelled. Claim 1 as presently amended recites, inter alia, "each said leg sized in length to be substantially completely selectively positionable and housed within said recess" thus clearly distinguishing over Stephens '629 which discloses no such feature. Indeed, for the braces R Stephens are not nor can they be completely positionable within the housing S because of the brace R being either in slots or outwardly of housing S. Nor does the use of longitudinal slots S3 provide a housing similar to the structure claimed in the present invention.

In addition, it appears that the stay links L of Stephens are necessary to control and/or limit the range of movement of brace-rods R. Further, the links L are attached to the traveling member I.

Stephens '629 is directed towards a freestanding structure. It can be used with two rods but only in conjunction with the two wheels of the bike to provide a four-point contact that is necessary for the freestanding nature of the use of the device.

Clyde '425 comprises a recess cut into a gunstock for supporting a firearm in an upright stowed position. The legs of Clyde '425 drop by gravity (line 85) and the spring-loaded legs 15 would be frictionally engaged with the inside surface of the casing 3 thus impeding movement in the downward direction.

As with the Stephens '629 device, Clyde '425 is designed as a freestanding device and accordingly at least three legs are required to accomplish its intended purposes.

It is important to note that Stephens '629 and Clyde '425 are both directed to freestanding devices for storing the associated apparatus as distinct from the present device being designed to be deployed when a firearm is to be used in the field.

Accordingly, applicant does not believe that either Stephens '629 or Clyde '425 is relevant art that teaches or suggests the present invention either singly or in any appropriate combination. These prior art devices are not so much directed to multi-leg supports as they are directed to freestanding supports of the described associated apparatus and require, as a matter of structure, at least three legs whereas the present invention does not.

Finally, the fore grip of the present invention is usable as a grip with the legs concealed therein. The present invention device includes a grip or gun handle and a concealable bipod. The present invention is fundamentally a different device than the Stephens and Clyde devices and is fundamentally different in use.

Independent claims 33 and 42 also recite a "fore grip" with legs that may be placed within a recess in a "substantially completely" manner and are also not disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited art in any appropriate combination.

17. With respect to the rejection of prior claim 12 and further in view of Kopman et al '807, new claim 45 includes "annular grooves" around the handle.

The grooves 14 of Kopman et al '807 are not "extending therearound" the leg channels 18 creating discontinuous grooves when the device is in use. In the present fore grip, the annular grooves 5 extend "around the circumference" of the fore grip section 2, as stated in paragraph 0020, line 1. The grooves 14 of Kopman et al '807 do not necessarily improve the grip of the user when the legs 15 are deployed, as do the grooves of the present device.

Accordingly, applicant does not believe that prior claim 2 or new claim 45 are obvious in light of Stephens '629, Clyde '425 and Kopman et al '807 in any appropriate combination.

The ultimate paragraph on page 10 of the Amendment filed on 7/5/05 contained typographical mistakes in that "24-25" in each occurrence should have been "24-45".

Accordingly, applicant believes that claims 1 (currently amended) and 24-45 are patentable over the recited art.

Respectfully submitted,


Arthur G. Yeager, Reg. No. 19,892

245-1 East Adams Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202-3365
Tel: (904) 355-9631
Fax: (904) 355-9632

Date: Oct. 12, 2005